

REMARKS

Claims 11-30 remain in this application.

In paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office action, the examiner objected to the drawings because the specification did not include reference to element 1. By the amendment to the specification reference to this element has been added.

While the examiner did not mention in the Office action, figures 1 and 2 include German words which have been removed in the attached drawings.

In paragraph 3 of the Office action, the examiner objected to the specification for several informalities. In actuality, the corrections mentioned by the examiner were made in the preliminary amendment of November 3, 2000. However, these amendments have been repeated in this amendment so as to make it easier to ensure that they are correctly entered.

With regard to the examiner's rejection of claims 29 and 30 as being indefinite, applicant responds as follows. Both of these claims are definite, they do not add method limitations. Claim 29 adds that the reducing agent is one of urea, ammonia, and a solution of urea and water. This is not a method limitation, but rather a clear statement that what is being used as the reducing agent is one of the three listed reducing agents. Likewise, claim 30 recites that the reducing agent is engine fuel. Again, this is not a method limitation, but is a clear statement of what the reducing agent is. Both of these claims add a structural limitation to claim 11,

the claim on which they depend, in that the claim is further limited by the actual chemical which is used as the reducing agent. This is a structural limitation.

With regard to the examiner's prior art rejection, it is pointed out that the Japanese reference, 05115749 discloses that a two part catalytic converter is provided, and that a portion of the hydrocarbons from the engine are delivered to the space between the two catalytic converter parts. This reference provides no teaching whatsoever of any relationship between how the hydrocarbons are delivered to the space between the catalytic converter parts and a turbine of an exhaust gas turbocharger. It is clear that there is no relationship taught in this reference between the pressure head developed by the turbine of a turbocharger and the delivery of ammonia to the exhaust gas line, let alone the direct relationship as recited in the claims of this application wherein the pressure head developed by the turbine of the turbocharger is used directly to deliver the reducing agent to the exhaust gas line.

In this Japanese reference, a switching valve 8 is used to control the amount of exhaust gas which is delivered to the space between the catalyst parts. This reference does not teach providing a bypass line and introducing into it a reducing agent.

The European reference, 0 381 236, teaches a turbocharger which has a turbine. It is clear that in EP 0 381 236 ammonia is contained in a vessel such as 16 in figure 6. This reference then teaches a plurality of sensors of various types

which are used to control the valve 14 which in turn controls the amount of ammonia which is delivered to injector 12. In this reference, the reducing agent is always provided to the exhaust gas line in a position such that it is delivered to the entire stream of exhaust gas, and not to only a portion of it, which portion is later recombined with the rest of the exhaust gas stream.

And this reference does not include any teaching whatsoever of using the pressure differential generated by the turbine of a turbocharger in the exhaust gas line to prepare and transport the ammonia which is used as the reducing agent.

The claims of this application clearly recite a specific relationship between the supply of the reducing agent and the turbine of a turbocharger which is not found in any of the cited prior art. Particularly, the claims recite that it is the difference in pressure which is generated by the turbine of the turbocharger which delivers the reducing agent to the exhaust gas line.

There is nothing in the cited prior art which would in any way lead one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the specific means recited in the claims of this application for transporting the reducing agent and supplying it to the exhaust gas line.

Specifically, in the claimed apparatus the exhaust gas drives a turbine of a turbocharger, and also operates the means for exhaust gas treatment. The head pressure generated by the turbine of the turbocharger is used to prepare and


Appl. No. 09/601,365
Amdt. dated June 2, 2004
In response to the Office action of Mar 9, 2004

transport the reducing to the exhaust gas line. This is a relationship which none of the cited prior art provides, and does not suggest. Clearly, this prior art does not make obvious the specific relationship recited in the claims of this application.

Should any other fees become necessary in connection with this amendment, the Commissioner is authorized to charge payment of any such fees to Deposit Account Number 07-2100.

For the above reasons, entry of this amendment and allowance of the claims in this application are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald E. Greigg
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 31,517
Customer No. 02119

Date: June 2, 2004

GREIGG & GREIGG, P.L.L.C.
1423 Powhatan Street
Suite One
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel. (703) 838-5500
Fax. (703) 838-5554
REG/SLS/clt

J:\Bosch\R34436\04-06-07, Amdt responsive to 1st OA of Mar 9, 04.wpd